

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

BRYAN P. BONHAM,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BARBARA K. CEGAVSKE,

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:22-cv-00819-GMN-DJA

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 6), of United States Magistrate Judge Daniel J. Albregts, which recommends dismissing the case.

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a *de novo* determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed. (*See* Min. Order, ECF No. 6) (setting a February 3, 2023, deadline for objections).


Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 6), is **ADOPTED in full.**

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the case is **DISMISSED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of Court shall close the case.

Dated this 7 day of February, 2023.

  
Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge  
United States District Court